

SCANNED

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

Lance Thomas Sandifer

v.

Ashley Sparks, et al.

RECEIVED
IN CLERK'S OFFICE

JUN 16 2014

U. S. DISTRICT COURT
MID. DIST. TENN.

OKD5K

This opposition
and Plaintiff's
memorandum

Case #: 1:13-0138

CDLE No. 58) were received
after the Court's Order

knowing the supervisor
Defendants motion to
dismiss CDLE No. 51). These

Opposition To Motion To Dismiss

papers are deemed motions to
reconsider but are DENIED as

the grounds allegations are
insufficient to unpar

Comes now the plaintiff, Lance Thomas Sandifer, in opposition to the defendants,
Sean Brantley, Ben Killingsworth and Arvil Chapman's motion to dismiss filed through
counsel. The defendants claim they, as supervisors, cannot be held liable for their
ratification of officer Sparks action because defendants shall

is an insufficient basis for liability under § 1983. They also say I attempt
to allege a constitutional violation as to my grievances. I do not. I only
mention my grievances because that's the way I went about seeking
protection from officer Sparks, and the grievance are my proof that defe
ndants Sean Brantley, Ben Killingsworth, and Arvil Chapman show deliberate
indifference to my plight. Due to their ratification of the violations, and
their deliberate indifference, ~~therefore~~ aforementioned defendants are entitled
to not dismissal but persecution.

In support of this motion I, the plaintiff, rely on the ~~contemporaneous~~
contemporaneously filed memorandum of law, a declaration, and a grievance.

Respectfully submitted,

L. Sandifer

Lance Sandifer, plaintiff

57